

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

BRANDON LEE BOSCHERT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:15CV1594 HEA
)	
JENNIFER SACHSE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the motion of Brandon Lee Boschert (registration no. 1265571) for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee [Doc. #2]. After reviewing plaintiff's financial information, the Court will assess a \$29.33 initial partial filing fee, which is twenty percent of plaintiff's six-month average deposit. Furthermore, based upon a review of the complaint, the Court finds that this action should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis in

either law or fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right. *Spencer v. Rhodes*, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), *aff'd* 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include "legal conclusions" and "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements." *Id.* at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 1950-51. This is a "context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense." *Id.* at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the "mere possibility of misconduct." *Id.* The Court must review the factual allegations in the complaint "to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief." *Id.* at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court may exercise its

judgment in determining whether plaintiff's conclusion is the most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. *Id.* at 1950-52.

Moreover, in reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992).

The Complaint

Plaintiff, an inmate at the Missouri Eastern Correctional Center ("MECC"), seeks \$1 million in actual damages and \$2 million in punitive damages for the violation of his constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named as defendants are Jennifer Sachse (MECC warden) and Dennis Nemeth (MECC parole officer). Plaintiff summarily alleges that, on or about April 15, 2015, he was "repeatedly sexually assaulted" by defendant Nemeth. Plaintiff further summarily alleges that he was denied due process by defendant Sachse "who refused to rectify and protect [plaintiff] from abuse under her supervision." In addition, plaintiff claims that other MECC employees helped "to cover and deny [his] claim" and engaged in "retaliation causing more mental anguish and suffering." Plaintiff states that he was "continuously harassed and given [conduct violations] for frivolous charges."

Discussion

Having carefully reviewed the complaint, the Court concludes that dismissal is warranted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff brings this action against defendants in their official capacities. *See Egerdahl v. Hibbing Community College*, 72 F.3d 615, 619 (8th Cir. 1995) (where a complaint is silent about defendant's capacity, Court must interpret the complaint as including official-capacity claims); *Nix v. Norman*, 879 F.2d 429, 431 (8th Cir. 1989). Naming a government official in his or her official capacity is the equivalent of naming the government entity that employs the official, in this case the State of Missouri. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989). "[N]either a State nor its officials acting in their official capacity are 'persons' under § 1983." *Id.* As a result, the complaint is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted as to all defendants, and therefore, the Court will dismiss this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

As additional grounds for dismissing this action, the Court notes that "[l]iability under section 1983 requires a causal link to, and direct responsibility for, the alleged deprivation of rights." *Madewell v. Roberts*, 909 F.2d 1203, 1208 (8th Cir. 1990); *see also Martin v. Sargent*, 780 F.2d 1334, 1338 (8th Cir. 1985) (claim not cognizable under § 1983 where plaintiff fails to allege defendant was personally

involved in or directly responsible for incidents that injured plaintiff); *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678-79 (legal conclusions and threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action that are supported by mere conclusory statements are not entitled to the assumption of truth). Because plaintiff does not set forth any non-conclusory facts indicating that defendants were directly involved in or personally responsible for the violation of his constitutional rights, and because the respondeat superior theory is inapplicable in § 1983 actions, *Boyd v. Knox*, 47 F.3d 966, 968 (8th Cir. 1995), plaintiff's claims are legally frivolous.

Moreover, plaintiff's allegations relative to receiving conduct violations for frivolous charges simply do not implicate constitutionally-protected interests, because they do not indicate that plaintiff was subjected to an "atypical and significant hardship . . . in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life." *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472 (1995). Plaintiff's allegations also do not indicate that he has suffered the type of atypical and significant hardship in which the state might conceivably create a liberty interest. *Cf. id.* at 485-86 (no atypical and significant hardship where inmate spent thirty days in solitary confinement); *Jones v. Baker*, 155 F.3d 810, 812-13 (6th Cir. 1998) (same; two and a half years in administrative segregation); *Hemphill v. Delo*, 124 F.3d 208 (8th Cir. 1997) (same; four days locked in housing unit, thirty days in disciplinary segregation, and approximately

290 days in administrative segregation); *Freitas v. Ault*, 109 F.3d 1335, 1337-38 (8th Cir. 1997) (same; ten days administrative segregation and thirty days on "on-call" status, as well as loss of higher paying job and numerous privileges); *Wycoff v. Nichols*, 94 F.3d 1187, 1190 (8th Cir. 1996) (same; ten days disciplinary detention and 100 days in maximum-security cell); *Moorman v. Thalacker*, 83 F.3d 970, 973 (8th Cir. 1996) (same; fifteen days of highest-level disciplinary detention and 107 days of less-restrictive disciplinary detention). For these reasons, this action will be dismissed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Accordingly,


IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff shall pay an initial partial filing fee of \$29.33 within thirty (30) days from the date of this order. Plaintiff is instructed to make his remittance payable to "Clerk, United States District Court," and to include upon it: (1) his name; (2) his prison registration number; (3) the case number; and (4) that the remittance is for an original proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue, because the complaint is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 14th day of December, 2015



HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE